

Dear Mr. & Ms. Pinkston :

Your comments have been received and will be placed into the case file for the commission's consideration as it deliberates in this matter. Thank you for your interest.

Andrew Melnykovich
Director of Communications
Kentucky Public Service Commission
(502) 564-3940 x 208

From: PSC - Public Information Officer
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 11:21 AM
To: Melnykovich, Andrew (PSC)
Subject: FW: Case #2007-00134

RECEIVED

NOV 15 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

From: Bob and Fran Pinkston[SMTP: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 11:20:18 AM
To: PSC - Public Information Officer
Subject: Case #2007-00134
Auto forwarded by a Rule

I got this link from Kentucky American, so I thought I'd take advantage.

Kentucky American's proposal fails the cost test. As the Beck report clearly shows, and as even Kentucky American admitted years ago, the Louisville option is considerably cheaper. These ratepayer savings are compounded by Louisville Water's guarantee of \$1.71 pricing through 2015, and only inflation-indexed increases after that. The ratepayers' savings would be tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions.

Kentucky American's proposal fails the duplication of facilities test. Louisville Water already has available all the capacity central Kentucky requires. This point is inarguable.

The only potential advantage Kentucky American's proposal has is that they might, *might*, be able to complete their project and deliver water sooner. But in the relatively small quantities that KAW is requiring in the first few years, Louisville Water has demonstrated that they can meet a nearly identical timeline.

A couple of other points about the timeline:

We're talking about a project a decade in the making, and a project to address water needs for generations to come. Several months or even a year or two should hold no sway on a decision of this magnitude.

Kentucky American makes a major point about how much work has already been done. They have no right to arrogantly assume their favored project is so "feasible" and such a "done deal" that they can harass property owners about easements, let out the construction bids, etc., and then brag about the work they've already done when the project has not even been approved!

Also, please take their timeline with a grain of salt. Their website claims construction will begin in the fall of 2007, with completion in the summer of 2010. Now they're claiming they'll be finished in April 2010, despite not being able to start until early 2008 at the absolute earliest. Start later and finish sooner- they'll say whatever it takes, I guess.

Thank you for your time.

Bob Pinkston
1033 Seminole Trail
Frankfort, KY 40601